SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VIII, No. 1 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | January 15, 1978

R&D Will Get a Bit of a Boost in New Budget

In the budget that he sends to Congress next week, Jimmy Carter will propose doling out dollars like they're the last drops of water on a marooned life raft.

With that understood, it's worth noting that research and development will be *relatively* well treated, and that basic research in particular will continue to benefit from the Ford-initiated policy of giving it an annual extra bit of nourishment to make up for the parched Nixon years.

But more important than dollar amounts, the new budget — which is the first to be wholly prepared by the year-old Carter Administration — reflects the outlines of policy decisions that are likely to exert influence on R&D for years to come. Specifically, the budget rejects any pinpointed "relief" efforts for such problems as equipment and job shortages, and aims at generally boosting research so as to enliven the entire R&D enterprise.

The key question, of course, is where's the money to come from? And the answer is that Mr. Carter has bought the advice of his science adviser, Frank Press, and will propose "stretching out" some costly "demonstration" projects so that additional funds can be diverted to R&D.

"Refusenik" Case Poses Test for US—USSR R&D Pact--Page 4

Prior to the budget's submission to Congress, details are extremely difficult to obtain, and SGR won't pretend to have had a pre-release look at the big book. But according to several usually accurate sources, the R&D segment shapes up as follows:

Total growth for R&D spending is "not great." Overall, it will be two to three points ahead of an anticipated inflation rate of five to six per cent. Basic research growth, however, will be a bit larger than that.

Looking at R&D as one big bundle, a substantial part of the growth will come from stretching Department of Energy fossil-fuel demonstration projects — Congress willing, which it might not be. There will be no tinkering, however, with solar-energy demonstration projects, of which Congress is so enamored that even the legislatively inept Carter planners recognize the folly of attempting to divert those funds.

In the politics of R&D, however, the fundamental difference in regard to the new budget is that R&D spending is now viewed as a whole, rather than as a collection of department and agency activities. And from this shift comes the strategy of throttling back on demonstration spending in favor of putting more money now into R&D.

Though the President, in awarding the National Medal of Science November 22 (SGR Vol. VII, No. 20), expressed concern about the aging of scientific equipment in university laboratories and lack of jobs for young researchers, the budget does not contain what might be referred to as welfare projects. (In the Nixon administration, for example, fellowships in federal laboratories were tried for a time as a means of providing research employment for newly graduated scientists).

The Carter approach, as he indicated in remarks at the medal ceremony, calls for prodding all federal agencies into giving a higher priority to their R&D acti-

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-Texas), chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, has announced that he'll retire at the end of this Congress. Teague, who has been in poor health, has occupied a major role in Congressional R&D-related affairs. He's ranking House member on the board of the Office of Technology Assessment, and served as chairman when that post rotated to the House last time around. Next in line on the S&T Committee are Don Fuqua (D-Fla.) and Walter Flowers (D-Ala.). The succession at this point is not clear.

Where's Science Indicators 1976, *the usually biennial report of the National Science Board, policymaking body of the National Science Foundation? Well, it was completed some months back and a copy was sent to the White House for clearance. And there it's been ever since. NSF officials doubt there's any problem with its contents, which range over various indices of American scientific performance. Rather, they say, it's just the old logjam in the office of Stewart Eizenstat, Mr. Carter's domestic affairs chief.*

Exxon Research and Engineering Corp., headed by Edward E. David Jr., former White House science adviser, is about to embark on a major expansion of university research support in energy-related fields. The aim is to provide long-term grants for established researchers.

Birthday: SGR commences its eighth year of publication with this issue.

. . . Budget Protests? Prospects Not Bright

(Continued From Page 1)

vities, with the expectation being that equipment and employment will benefit from the ensuing economic uplift. In line with this broadscale response to the money problem, the budget does not single out the National Science Foundation — traditionally the mainstay of academic research — for any specially favored treatment. Or, as one Administration aide put it, "NSF is not the strong spear carrier."

If that's the case, the odds do not look good for various job-promoting initiatives — such as early retirement subsidies and university-industry collaboration — that NSF Director Richard Atkinson has been proposing. Science policy, however, is a mansion of many chambers, and it's possible that Atkinson's proposals might still be pursued off in one corner of the federal research reservation. But from what we've heard of the budget, the master plan is not sympathetic to such specifically targeted operations.

Some of the other details gleaned by SGR indicate that the National Institutes of Health is to be budgeted for an increase near 10 per cent, with most of the new money to be focused on basic research.

The Department of Defense will continue to take a large part of the growth in basic research spending; its increase is to be at least 13 per cent. Space science, which has been hit hard by NASA's emphasis on the space shuttle, is due for a relatively big jump, which will amount to an additional $100 million. And the Department of Agriculture's new program of competitive basic research grants is slated in the Carter budget for a near-doubling, to $30 million a year.

Another big gainer in the spending plan is climate research, which would be increased by 30 per cent, along the lines of a major program proposed by the Interagency Committee on Atmospheric Sciences. Among the agencies sharing in this growth would be NASA, NSF, NOAA, and DOE.

When the budget is made public, it is almost certain to provoke horrific howling among the many segments of society — not just the scientific community — that are heavily dependent on the federal treasury. That science has been relatively well treated is likely to have little dampening effect on science's howling, some of which, in anticipatory fashion, actually commenced a few weeks ago. High-energy physics, which, by its very nature, is insatiable, has been filling the press with assorted tales of impending European superiority in that arcane field of research — unless, of course, the fiscal faucet is opened wide for new machines on US territory.

The difficulty that faces science lobbying at present is that science does, in fact, have good friends in the Carter Administration, and any burst of outrage at the budget is likely to be taken as ingratitude. In the days of Nixon, sniping at budget decisions made sense, for Nixon and his cronies were indeed down on science and often sought to do it mischief — even to the extent of toying with schemes to "punish" MIT because some of its leading lights were opposed to the SST and the anti-ballistic missile.

Science thus faces a difficult dilemma in its natural quest to squeeze all it can out of the federal government. Presidential science adviser Frank Press appears to be reasonably influential with Carter, and there is no doubt at all that Press is sympathetic to the needs of the scientific community, particularly the academic segment of it, from which he comes. In response to the inevitable complaint of not enough, he can plausibly respond, maybe so, but science got more than we originally thought it would.

What is not to be discounted is the conservative, skeptical, even pennypinching mindset of Carter and his inner ring from Georgia. Still "outsiders" after a year in Washington, they are deaf to the old arguments for more that heavily influenced budget makers in past administrations. Traditional Washington still finds them unfathomable as they proceed in their tunnel-visioned efforts to remake the federal establishment. "It can't go on like this" was a common sentiment throughout the first year. But it has and it very likely will continue to do so — which means that end runs to Capitol Hill will provide science with little prospect for success.

The great exception in the past was biomedical re-

(Continued on Page 3)

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1978

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Pamela Moore

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $75 (two years, $140); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Mental Health Chief Gets Axed by Califano

In a Christmas-season move so sudden that it surprised even those who knew it was coming sooner or later, HEW Secretary Joseph Califano sacked Bertram Brown from the directorship of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), a post Brown had held since 1970. Califano, ringing with praise for Brown, said the ouster was necessary to make way for "new blood."

Brown's resignation was requested in a meeting December 20 with fellow psychiatrist Gerald Klerman, Califano's choice to head the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA), the Institute's parent agency. Klerman had been on the job less than two weeks — he was sworn in December 9 — when he asked Brown to leave, carrying out what he called a "joint decision" in which he, Assistant Secretary for Health Julius Richmond and Califano agreed that Brown had to go.

The reason, according to the principals, was that Brown simply had been around too long and, by Califano's reckoning, job switching in HEW middle management is all to the good. "I have a strong belief that it is important to invigorate this Department with new blood," he explained at a December 29 press conference, adding that "one of the tragedies in human terms ... at HEW" is that lower- and middle-level management people haven't had the chance "to have two or three careers over the course of their stay here."

At the same time, Califano announced that Brown, 46, a commissioned officer with the rank of Assistant Surgeon General in the Public Health Service and with two years to go to retirement, would become special assistant to Richmond, a previously unoccupied slot with ill-defined responsibilities.

While many observers, including some who have been quite close to Brown over the years, accept the theory that Califano and his captains saw the need for new leadership at NIMH — as one put it, "leadership that is disassociated with the policies of the past" — few accept the notion that it was nothing personal. Brown,

Social Science Report

whose political savvy and not inconsiderable ability to charm key members of Congress helped pull mental health programs through two Republican administrations bent on doing away with them, does not, as one source noted, "play the bureaucratic game."

For example, in a recent maneuver around Califano, Brown launched a successful fight to restore planned cuts in next year's mental health budget by appealing directly to the White House. In addition, he has from time to time criticized the current administration for being as thrifty as Nixon-Ford. According to one veteran, that kind of behavior made him a hero and a martyr during the previous administrations "when the enemy was clear cut," but not so now. There was a general feeling that while such actions didn't hurt him — the decision by Califano to clear away everything down to the Institute level at ADAMHA was made long ago — they didn't help him any either.

Nevertheless, HEW brass, including Klerman, emphasize that Brown was not fired — merely reassigned. "Commissioned officers in the Public Health Service, like other semi-military groups, frequently are offered new assignments," he says. But, by whatever name, the object seemed to be more a matter of removing Brown from NIMH rather than placing him somewhere else. As the timing would suggest, the action was taken in such a way as to attract the least attention possible, especially from Congress. The Senate's own Mr. Health, Edward Kennedy, for example, not only was out of town but in China.

Insiders note that Brown was not actually offered another job — not even by onetime associate Richmond with whom he met on December 23. In fact, his new duty, described by sources close to Richmond as a stop-

(Continued on Page 4)

BUDGET

(Continued From Page 2)

search, which benefited financially from a variety of direct connections between NIH and Congress. But that game is long over and the chances for reviving it are nil. The present management at NIH is not in the buccaneer tradition of its distant predecessor. And even if it were, there is no chance that the Administration would long tolerate it. Furthermore, the key biomedical slots on Congressional committees are no longer filled with legislators who are devoted to outspending the White House.

Added to that is the fact that the newly installed Congressional budgeting system makes it very difficult for champions of particular activities to pile runaway increases on Administration requests. Here and there it does happen, but, in general — especially when the Congress and the White House are of the same party — it's very difficult.

What it boils down to, then, for R&D is that its friends at court are indeed good friends; it's being relatively well treated at a time when many other segments of the federal enterprise are not faring nearly so well, and the budget — which we'll report on in detail in the next issue — is the best that can be hoped for. — DSG

. . . Brown Survived Enemies, Lost to "Friends"

(Continued From Page 3)

gap until something better comes along, was announced only after news stories reported that Brown intended to fight and alluded to the possible "politicization" of NIMH only a year after Califano, with considerable ballyhoo, pledged he would "depoliticize" the National Institutes of Health by not dismissing NIH Director Donald Fredrickson.

In some respects, Brown's leave-taking looks like just the latest in the series that began when Califano arrived.

But there are other ways in which it seems a bit different from the typical political changing of the guard. For one thing, ironically enough, Brown survived the perils of the previous administrations and helped keep NIMH intact only to be turned out of the stewardship of the agency by an administration that has given mental health a top priority. Those who sought the change — including the White House, which concurred in the decision — are by no means Brown's political opponents; they are presumably ideological sidekicks, professional associates, political kin and, as Brown has noted somewhat ruefully, friends. In an emotional farewell meeting to the NIMH staff, Brown spoke wryly of the necessity in this case, to learn to love and forgive one's friends, not just one's enemies. What's more, both Richmond and Califano commended Brown for his ability and competence even as they were asking him to clean out his desk.

At the very least, Brown's departure signals the end of an era for NIMH and for federal involvement in mental health, a period marked by the expansion of such programs as community mental health centers; growth of political activity among mental health professions and the birth of a considerable mental health lobby; the rise of the mental health law movement, which has ushered in such major issues as right to treatment and deinstitutionalization; increased pressure from Congress to pursue political mandates for NIMH such as research on rape and other social issues, and general political and philosophical tumult.

According to some, Brown's major problem was that he was so strongly embodies that time — "he is so wedded to an era," noted one observer — that the HEW hierarchy decided he would have a tough time following through on the policy and program changes planned by the Califano team, even though a number of those changes, in professional training for example, began under Brown during the past couple of years.

As for the way in which the Brown affair was handled, there is at least some suggestion that it didn't have to come to that. Despite the appearances of wholesale political skullduggery implied by the bald facts, sources say Brown was told more than once by Administration colleagues that he would probably be asked to vacate the post. The hope was that he would decide on his own to go elsewhere. But, in a characteristic quip at his final staff meeting, Brown told the gathering: "I'm pleased not to honor my promise. So many times at all-hands meetings, I've been asked 'what are your plans?' And, I've answered, 'I plan to stay until they carry me out dead.' Well, it was close, but I am walking out alive." — PM

US Academy Comes to Aid of Soviet Dissident

The case of Anatoly Scharansky, a Soviet computer specialist, is shaping up as a major test of how much the Soviets value scientific contact with the United States.

Do they value it sufficiently to relent in their abuse of Scharansky, against whom a charge of treason has been hinted following 10 months of incomunicado imprisonment? Or, as the Soviet press has thundered, will they do pretty much as they please with the young scientist, even to the point of jeopardizing US scientific contacts that they have carefully cultivated?

The issue arises, and in unusually clearcut terms, as the result of a forceful intervention in Scharansky's behalf by the National Academy of Sciences. How and why the traditionally cautious and non-combative Academy took this step is a separate and instructive matter. But first let's look at the case of this unfortunate victim of Soviet efforts to deal with the "refusenik" movement, so-called after those who have gone public with their dissidence after being refused permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Scharansky, a 29-year-old Jew, was fired from his job as a computer specialist at an oil and gas research institute three years ago after several attempts to obtain an exit visa to go to Israel.

In 1975, his wife was permitted to leave the country, with the understanding that he would soon be allowed to follow. But after she had gone, Soviet authorities informed him that he would not be permitted to leave because his work had been of a classified nature. Scharansky, who is fluent in English, disputed this contention, became active in dissident activities in Moscow, and carried his case to Western news correspondents and visitors to Moscow.

Last March, he was arrested, and Soviet authorities said he was under investigation for alleged contacts with

(Continued on Page 5)

. . . Handler Warns of Danger to Science Pact

(Continued From Page 4)

the CIA. President Carter subsequently took the unusual step of announcing that he had looked into the matter and that there was no basis for the allegation. Meanwhile, Scharansky was held incommunicado, and though no charges were brought against him, the Soviet press strongly suggested that he was under investigation for treason, a charge that carries a penalty ranging from 10 years' imprisonment to death. So far as is known, treason had never before been raised against any of the present day crop of Soviet dissidents.

Now back to the National Academy of Sciences, which has been under increasing pressure to act in behalf of the often-cited brotherhood of science and come to the assistance of Soviet scientist dissidents. A lot of this pressure has originated with the Federation of American Scientists, which refers to itself as both the "voice of science on Capitol Hill" and "the conscience of the scientific community for more than a quarter of a century." The main figure behind the voice and the conscience is FAS Director Jeremy J. Stone, who has frequently needled the Academy to employ its prestige and lofty connections in behalf of its Soviet colleagues.

Stone, who has visited Moscow to confer with some of the dissidents, has publicly scoffed at Academy President Philip Handler's claims for the alleged value of working behind the scenes. The two are not on good terms on this matter, nor was the relationship improved when Stone had the temerity to end run the Academy leadership and sign up a good number of NAS members in support of FAS statements in behalf of the dissidents.

Until recently, however, Handler, with rare exception, held to the position that the Academy could be most effective by working quietly. The biggest of the few exceptions came in 1973, when, in response to intense harrassment against Andrei Sakharov, Handler sent a stiff letter to the President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, warning that "Were Sakharov to be deprived of his opportunity to serve the Soviet people and humanity, it would be extremely difficult to imagine successful fulfillment of American pledges of binational scientific cooperation. . ."

Since the Academy is the US government's instrument for administering a good chunk of Soviet-American scientific traffic, the implied threat was viewed in Washington as a pretty strong one. At the time it was made, many persons believed that the Soviets were close to imprisoning Sakharov; that he remains free, though under frequent harrassment, is taken to indicate that the Soviets do indeed value their contacts with American science.

However, in contrast to the young and previously unknown Scharanksy, Sakharov enjoyed the advantages of celebrity to the point where powerful intervention in his behalf was sure to come from one place or another. As so-called father of the Soviet H-bomb, it is not unlikely that he still possesses powerful friends at home, despite years of open opposition to Soviet repressiveness. In addition, he has been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, and he is a foreign associate of the US National Academy. In 1973, then, the Academy, in a sense, was coming to the assistance of one of its own.

But why now Scharansky, the obscure computer specialist?

The answer is that the Scharansky case is more outrageous than most, bearing as it does the threat of a capital charge. Furthermore, Jimmy Carter's human rights campaign has given a lot of thrust to the issue of helping foreign victims of repressive governments. Last Spring, with human rights a much-talked-of issue, the Academy set up a Committee on Human Rights, with which some 350 of its 1200 members have since become associated as corresponding members. Finally, Scharansky's wife has been touring the US, talking to all sorts of groups about the outrageous treatment of her husband. All in all, it would have been surprising if the Academy hadn't sought to assist him.

The degree of intervention is actually relatively mild, consisting of a request from Handler to President Brezhnev that "appropriately qualified legal observers" be permitted to attend and report on what is assumed to be an impending trial.

That request, however, was accompanied by words similar to those used in behalf of Sakharov: "Future relations between the scientific communities of our two countries could well be affected by world opinion of the fairness of that trial and its outcome."

Handler's cable has so far drawn no direct response. But after it was dispatched, a Soviet newspaper angrily announced that outsiders would not be permitted to dictate the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, and even stronger hints were issued about charging Scharansky with treason. Beyond that, however, no more regarding the case has been heard from the Soviets.

The Russians, of course, can do as they please in this matter. If they decide that scientific contact is more important than dissident abuse, they can swiftly settle the case in a fashion satisfactory to Scharansky and his friends. But if they choose to be nasty about the matter, what penalties might they, in fact, incur?

SGR inquiry has failed to turn up any plan to pull the plug on Soviet-American scientific cooperation. But that doesn't mean that Handler was raising idle threats.

The Academy is a classic case of latent power. Its

(Continued on Page 6)

NSF Reorganizes Applied Research Activities

The National Science Foundation has now issued the final word on its latest internal reorganization, and the details are not simple. But hang on; here's how it goes:

What used to be known as the Research Applications Directorate, which was homebase for what used to be known as the program of Research Applied to National Needs (RANN), has been more or less replaced by the newly created Directorate for Applied Science and Research Application (ASRA). The change becomes official on February 6. What now comes out as ASRA was originally going to be called the Science Applications Directorate, but the acronym for that choice was not considered appealing. In any case, Jack T. Sanderson stays on as chief of the new setup, with the title of assistant director.

An NSF announcement explains the reorganization as follows:

"Besides strengthening links between applied and basic research, ASRA was established to improve the ties between research applications activities and user groups in State and local governments, private industry, and other Federal mission agencies; to focus problem-oriented research applications on fewer national issues to increase the impact of NSF programs; and to provide a funding source for high quality applied research."

The specifics of the reorganization defy brevity, so we must make do with NSF's own words, which follow:

"The new Directorate will consist of six units: the Office of the Assistant Director (AD/ASRA), the Office of Problem Analysis (OPA), the Division of Integrated Basic Research (IBR), the Division of Applied Research (AR), the Division of Problem-Focused Research Applications (PFRA), and the Division of Intergovernmental Science and Public Technology (ISPT).

"The Office of the Assistant Director will carry out the policy-making, management, review and coordination functions of that section. Richard J. Green will be director of operations in ASRA and Dr. Larry Tombaugh will be special assistant for oversight and evaluation. A new deputy assistant director for ASRA will be named later.

"The Office of Problem Analysis will work with internal NSF and external groups and organizations in assessing problems for strategic and programmatic planning by the Assistant Director. Dr. L. Vaughn Blankenship will serve as acting head of this office until a permanent head can be named.

"The Division of Integrated Basic Research will provide a direct link between ASRA and the basic research directorates of NSF by jointly identifying basic research related to significant national problems. The division will be headed by Dr. Donald Senich.

"The Division of Applied Research will be organized into two sections, an Applied Social and Behavioral Sciences Section and an Applied Physical, Mathematical and Biological Sciences Section. The objectives of this division will be to support applied research proposals which will benefit social, economic, and technical problems and policy issues. It also will identify and stimulate the growth of new technologies and processes based on discoveries in various fields of science. The division will be headed by Dr. Blankenship.

"The Division of Problem-Focused Research Applications will contain four research programs: Earthquake Hazard Mitigation, Chemical Threats to Man and the Environment, Biological Alternatives for Industrial Feedstocks, and Community Water Management. The division goal will be to support the application of scientific and technological capabilities to selected problems of society which are of critical national importance. Dr. Charles C. Thiel will head the division.

"The Division of Intergovernmental Science and Public Technology will be transferred from the Research Applications Directorate to the new ASRA with its functions and organizations unchanged. The division will continue to be headed by William Wetmore.

"In other changes, the Technology Assessment program will be transferred to the Directorate for Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs (STIA) and the Weather Modification program will be transferred to the Directorate for Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth, and Ocean Sciences."

SCHARANSKY

(Continued From Page 5)

members occupy key positions throughout the American research enterprise. It is rare for them to agree on any concerted course of action, but this is so only because it is rare for any issue to arise that calls for concerted action on their part.

However, the Scharansky case is shaping up as one of those rarities. If the Soviets continue to proceed against him in an outrageous fashion, what they are likely to encounter is a lot of closed doors throughout the American scientific community. As a practical matter, the US-USSR exchange program is an interesting curiosity for American scientists and a serious matter of getting at the frontiers of science for Soviet scientists. By almost all accounts, they learn a lot from us and we get back little in return. The extent to which they value their access to American science will be clearly revealed by how they respond to Handler's request.

French Science in Turmoil Over Job Security

Paris. Having gone through a boom, research and development in France is now going through a severe economic slowdown. One result is an eruption of conflict over the future of multitudes of scientists whose employment is not secured by legal guarantees. These are known as *hors-statut* (without-statute) employees, and it is their uncertain work prospects that have triggered strikes in several universities in recent months.

To understand the controversy, it is necessary to know that in France, most reserachers in public laboratories are protected by civil service regulations. This means that once they have been hired by a university or taken a position in a laboratory operated by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), they can expect lifetime employment, regardless of performance. They are said to have "the statute."

One consequence of this system of lifetime tenure is that a lot of scientists remain on the payroll long after the projects for which they were originally hired have declined in importance or, perhaps, have even been disbanded. Since the number of protected positions does not increase greatly year by year, and movement from one research institution to another is uncommon in France, the result has been over-staffing in obsolete areas and shortages of personnel in new, promising fields.

To overcome this rigidity, the government many years ago adopted and then expanded the practice of hiring *hors-statut* researchers. In terms of training and performance, these were indistinguishable from those who had the good fortune to come under civil service protection. But when they were looking for jobs, there were no funds available for taking them on as civil service employees in their specialized fields and they were hired as non-civil servants.

To finance their employment, laboratories would often engage in a good deal of rule bending, such as paying their salaries out of budgets for equipment. When times were good, particularly in the early 1970s, government bookkeepers tended to wink at this practice. This was especially the case when a laboratory needed specialized talents but did not have authorization to take on additional staff as civil servants.

These happy times, now unfortunately over, have left behind an angry residue of scientists who are no longer young, who lack job guarantees, and for whom funds for salaries are increasingly in short supply. With job prospects elsewhere in very poor supply, they face a difficult future, while their civil servant colleagues, with whom they have shared laboratories for many years, are fully protected against economic insecurity.

The fire has been smouldering for some time. In 1976, the government recognized the difficulties and proposed a program to integrate the *hors-statut* employees into the civil service. Such a proposal was, in fact, contained in the seventh five-year research plan. But as frequently happens here with such matters, nothing much happened. The program was badly prepared, to the extent that it was at all prepared. It took a full year to explore the legal aspects of the proposed integration. Meanwhile, dissatisfaction and controversy have rapidly spread.

Researchers and their unions have noticed large discrepencies between the data published by the Secretary of State for Universities and their own figures. The secretary has authority over university and CNRS laboratories, and, according to his figures, there are 4000 *hors-statut* research workers. The unions, however, place the figure at nearly 10,000.

Furthermore, using the burden of integration as a pretext, the secretary has proposed that *hors statut* salary increases be postponed.

Nothing else was needed to trigger angry opposition, and not surprisingly it erupted at South Paris University, whose president, a well-known leftist, presides over laboratories that contain about one-tenth of *hors-statuts* of France; meanwhile, all the unions involved have formed a common front against wage restrictions.

And then into the picture comes the Ministry of Finance with a proposal that has further inflamed the situation, namely, that each *hors statut* who receives civil service status should be considered a newly recruited scientist. This proposal has created an impossible dilemma for university chairmen and laboratory managers: Either they reject integration, and thereby provoke strikes, or they accept the switch to civil service status and close off the possibility of recruiting young scientists for the next two or three years.

Further complicating the situation is the fact that many of those who are considered to be *hors statut* scientists do not possess advanced degrees; among these are a good number who, though called scientists, are actually technicians or managers, and, in some cases, secretaries or clerks. The government wants to drop many of these, while the left parties, particularly the Communists, contend that the only solution is to give civil service status to all involved.

The government has so far taken no action, despite a series of strikes in November and December. In this matter, as with so many others, inaction is likely to prevail until after national elections, in March. Meanwhile, gloom, bitterness and paralysis are in ample supply in the French scientific community. — FS

News Notes: Danish Windmill, OTA Reports, AAAS

The Department of Energy will provide $146,000 toward the estimated $300,000 cost of refurbishing a large wind generator that's been idle in Denmark for a decade. Under an agreement with the Research Association of the Danish Electricity Supply agency, the machine will be studied for resistance to corrosion and other wear and tear factors. Located at Gedser, Denmark, the generator saw 10 years of service before it went out of operation.

•

The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research has had its term of existence extended to next October 31, as the result of a law President Carter signed November 23.

The Commission has already completed five reports and is planning additional ones on the following subjects: research involving those institutionalized as mentally infirm, the performance of Institutional Review Boards, basic ethical principles, the application of ethical principles in the delivery of health services by the Department of Health Education and Welfare, advances in biomedical and behavioral research and technology, and research not subject to HEW regulations.

•

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has available, without charge, a bibliography of its many publications. To obtain a copy, request OTA-P-58 from the Office of Technology Assessment, Publications Office, US Congress, Washington, DC 20510. Telephone: (202) 224-3827.

•

The American Association for the Advancement of Science is inviting applications for the sixth year of its Congressional Science and Engineering Fellow Program. The one-year fellowships, with stipends of $18,000, begin next September 1. Four are in the areas of child and family policy, including child development, education and health policy. The fifth is unrestricted in terms of area of interest. For additional information: Richard A. Scribner, Director, AAAS Congressional Science and Engineering Fellow Program, 1776 Massachusetts Ave. NW., Wash., DC 20036. Telephone: (202) 467-5441.

•

Jacob A. Brody has been appointed Associate Director for Epidemiology, Demography, and Biometry of the National Institute on Aging. Brody formerly was Chief of the Epidemiology Branch of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke Collaborative and Field Research Center. According to an NIA announcement, he will be responsible "for developing a research program on human aging and the diseases of the elderly and for providing direction to epidemiologic, demographic, and biometric investigations of the NIA."

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106